

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The applicants have studied the office action mailed September 3, 2008, and have made the changes believed appropriate to place the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Although Applicants amended claims, Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims in their pre-amended form are invalid for being unpatentable, as the present claim amendments are for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in this present application and one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Claims 1-20 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,553,455. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that the Examiner has not yet indicated subject matter which is allowable apart from the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, applicants response to the double patenting rejection is deferred until the Examiner has indicated that there is otherwise allowable subject matter.

Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Steele et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,884,056 (referred to hereafter as Steele). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1, for example, is directed to a “method for providing stream linking in audio/video disk media, comprising: when additional reading or writing locations in streams are desired in which each stream of locations is a range of addresses on disk media for storing audio/video data in a contiguous area, sending a linked stream request with a number of a primary stream; initiating a linked stream that is linked to the primary stream; setting a pointer for the linked stream to the same location as a pointer for the primary stream; and during operation, processing the pointers for both the linked stream and the primary stream.” It is the Examiner’s position that the limitation “initiating a linked stream that is linked to the primary stream” is met by the Steele reference citing col. 9 lines 32-52 of the Steele reference. The applicants respectfully disagree.

For example, it appears to be the Examiner's position that the sequence 52 (Fig. 7) of thumbnail images of the Steele reference is a "stream" as that term is used in claim 1. The applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the term "stream" as used in the context of claim 1 is a "stream of locations" which is a "range of addresses on disk media for storing audio/video data in a contiguous area." Support for this amendment includes page 2, lines 18-20 of the present application. It is clear that the sequence 52 (Fig. 7) of *thumbnail images* of the Steele reference is not a "stream of locations" which is a "range of addresses on disk media for storing audio/video data in a contiguous area" as required by claim 1. On the contrary, the Examiner concedes that the thumbnail images are mere "representations of a video object."

However, even if the Examiner's position were assumed to be correct, a position not conceded by the present applicants, it is clear that the Examiner has failed to cite any teaching or suggestion of "initiating a linked stream that is *linked* to the primary stream" as required by claim 1. On the contrary, even if it is assumed (as set forth above) that the sequence 52 (Fig. 7) of thumbnail images is a "stream" as that term is used in claim 1, it is clear that the Examiner's citations to the Steele reference discuss having only *one* sequence of thumbnails *at a time* for a particular video object. Thus, if a user selects a thumbnail, the server selects a "new set of key frames falling between the selected frame and the next frame (step 60) ... and the selected new frames are then displayed (step 62), essentially in the same manner as before (steps 30 and 32 of the FIG. 4)." Steel, col. 9, lines 32 set seq. Thus, it appears that the initial set of representations of the video object is discarded and a different set of representations of the video object is substituted. In other words, the initial sequence of thumbnails is discarded and a different set of thumbnails is substituted. Accordingly, it is clear that the Examiner has failed to cite any teaching or suggestion of "initiating a linked stream that is linked to the primary stream" as required by claim 1.

It appears to be the Examiner's position that selecting an interval within the data object of the Steele reference meets the recited operation of "setting a pointer." The applicants respectfully disagree. However, even if the Examiner's position were assumed to be correct, a position not conceded by the present applicants, it is clear that the Examiner has failed to cite any teaching or suggestion of "during operation, processing the pointers for

both the linked stream and the primary stream” as required by claim 1. [emphasis added.]

As set forth above, once a new interval of the video object is selected, it appears that the prior selected interval of the video object is discarded. Thus, even if it is assumed (for purposes of discussion) that selecting an interval within the data object of the Steele reference meets the recited operation of “setting a pointer” that such interval selection is discarded once a new interval is selected. Accordingly, it is clear that the Examiner has failed to cite any teaching or suggestion of “during operation, processing the pointers for *both* the linked stream and the primary stream” as required by claim 1. [emphasis added.]

The rejection of the dependent claims is improper for the reasons given above. Moreover, the dependent claims include additional limitations, which in combination with the base and intervening claims from which they depend provide still further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

The Examiner has made various comments concerning the anticipation or obviousness of certain features of the present inventions. Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants have addressed those comments directly hereinabove or the Examiner’s comments are deemed moot in view of the above response.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0466.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7970 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: December 3, 2008

By: /William Konrad/

William K. Konrad
Registration No. 28,868

Please direct all correspondences to:
William K. Konrad
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7970 Fax: 310-556-7984